# The Inquirer

THE UNITARIAN AND FREE CHRISTIAN WEEKLY · Founded 1842

REGISTERED AS A NEWSPAPER No. 6056 Saturday, August 2, 1958 Price 3½d.


## A VIEW FROM THE BASE

THE summit is usually covered with clouds. When they clear the view is wide and exhilarating, but they soon come back again. There are few clouds at the base. The view, it is true, is narrow and restricted, and the other side of the mountain certainly cannot be seen, but what can be seen is clear enough in detail — and it is a view that may well be examined before beginning the climb.

Why did the Americans and British go into Lebanon and Jordan? The answer in detail is something like the following:

The Americans had been supporting the Lebanese Government, popular or otherwise, for some time; the British, with American help, had been sustaining King Hussein. The successful revolt in Iraq made it reasonably certain that the Lebanese Government would be overthrown, and that King Hussein in Jordan was in danger of assassination. If the Americans and British were not to throw up their Middle East policy and desert their Middle East friends, they had to go to the help of the Lebanese Government and King Hussein. That this was a possible contingency had been well known for some time. The only reason for the Western powers not intervening was fear of what Russia might do. This was known everywhere, and non-intervention meant a great Russian success. The Western powers would have been disclosed as not being willing or able to save their friends. Someone had to decide whether it was wise to be implicitly defeated by Russia or to intervene. It was decided to intervene.

### For Good Or Ill

It is doubtful as a result of all this whether Mr. Krushchev regards Mr. Macmillan and Mr. Eisenhower as villains. He is eager enough to meet them at the summit. The occasion of the intervention might have come suddenly out of the blue, but that it was prepared for and expected is nobody's secret. It may be assumed that the American administration discussed with more anxiety possible Russian reaction than the moralities of going into Lebanon, and it may be guessed that this was a British preoccupation before the troops went into Jordan.

And what alternative was there? Arabs are not pacifists, "rebels" under arms are not particularly mindful of the United Nations (few of them have heard of the organisation), democracy in the Middle East is not quite the clear-cut thing that it is in this country and America. For good or ill, power meets power in intrigue and challenge. To suppose that it is not there is to suppose that there is no base from which to start for the summit, or reason for climbing there.

### Arab Nationalism

What can be done about the view from the base? The answer to this seems immediately simple. It is now assumed with some degree of certainty that there is something called Arab nationalism. It is doubtful whether anybody knows exactly what this is, including the Arabs. This must be found out. But it supposes some kind of unity among the ninety million or so Arabs in the Middle East. It seems to be thought desirable in face of this unity that the Western powers (and presumably Russia too) should disclaim any influence over the Arab nations. In other words, leave the Lebanon and Jordan as soon as possible. And — if not as soon as possible — sooner or later it will have to be done. Ten thousand troops in Lebanon and two thousand in Jordan (supplied from the air) is not a reassuring position for anyone.

### The New Situation

But what then? Where is the simplicity? The whole of Arab nationalism will be ranged against Israel. Whatever may be the rights or wrongs of this, and they are terribly mixed, and no one can unravel them at this time of day, the West will have to support or defend Israel. At this time of day what is now the Jewish nation cannot be driven into the sea. A new Middle East situation will be created with the West supporting Israel; and Russia? It would be assuming the existence of no rivalry between Russia and the West to assume that Russia would not exploit that situation. If and when summit talks take place about the Middle East, and American and British troops are withdrawn, it is probable that there will be another common frontier between Russia and the West. It will be the boundary between Israel and its neighbours.

### The United Nations

A view from the base is necessary. Nationalism as it is forming in the Middle East is not a pleasant thing. It has to be co-ordinated with a world situation. Summit talks may or may not be useful, but they certainly will not undertake that long-term co-ordination. That can only take place from the United Nations Organisation. The long-term salvation of the world lies there. But — the

China recognized by most of the countries of the world is not even represented there yet.

The oddest thing about the summit is that Mr. Krushchev is willing to meet the Security Council on which the China he recognizes is not even represented. The clouds are swirling around in a strange way.

---

# THE RANGE OF THE POSSIBLE

**By Dr. S. P. Bhatia**

MAN starts his career as a tiny unicellular creature. The intra- and extra-uterine growth is subject to numerous influences. He is capable of transcending all external influences. The single cell has within it the potentialities of not only physical growth, but also moral and spiritual expansion. Physical growth is limited by physical laws, but there is no limit to the growth of wisdom and understanding. He has the power and the capacity to bring the heavens within his grasp.

Man lives on two planes—the physical and the spiritual. On the physical plane we fight to accumulate, we fight for our security, we fight for our rights, we fight to conquer nature, we keep a watchful eye on our enemies, but on the spiritual plane we renounce, we love and see in the world around us, not as arrayed against us in hostility, but in unity through divine presence. When man's life is spiritually richer, when he harbours no ill will against his brethren, when the poet in him dances in rhythmic measure to the pulsating life around him, when his love extends beyond all barriers of race and geography, when his vocation is a means of self-fulfilment, when all his activities are subordinated to one supreme purpose, the practice of nobility, his culture grows, his wealth increases, art flourishes. With all this there is a general flowering of his personality. But when he develops indifference and even contempt for the less fortunate brethren, when his sympathy has well-demarcated boundaries he becomes restless, because he is afraid of those he despises. He loses himself in the maze of psychological complexes, art declines, poetry is no longer inspired, and life steadily becomes barren and meaningless.

Man loses his freedom when the turbulent, material forces, cloud his judgment, undermine his moral fibre, when he retracts more and more into self-sufficiency. But he gains his freedom when he emerges from the shackles of materialism.

★

We are all at different stages of religious development. Every human being, no matter what creed he professes, is confronted with the same psychological and emotional problems. The purpose of religion is to so chasten our being, that our souls may be suffused with God's light. The task of our economic and political experts is to provide us with earthly comforts, to make life easier and pleasanter. But to be tolerant to our neighbours, to have peace of mind in the midst of plenty, to be able to fight the battles of life with faith and courage, to be able to conquer sword with love, and to be able to perform daily tasks howsoever small, in a spirit of dedication, no economist or legislator can give. In the last resort in peace or in war, in the midst of plenty or want, in success or in failure, man has to find his own balance.

Religion has inspired our culture. It has fertilized human imagination. It has stimulated and given impetus to man's creative urges. All aesthetic and cultural pursuits are man's strivings for the unknown. Furthermore, religion teaches us to cultivate humility and love. Thereby it helps to unleash the dynamic forces inherent in our soul. In our own times Gandhi demonstrated what an intensity of spiritual force can accomplish. Vino Bhave in India is carrying on a tremendous economic revolution through love born of profound religious experience.

Our anatomical frame encloses vital organs, which in health perform certain functions. These are delicately co-ordinated through nervous and humoral channels. The purpose is to enable man to think, to discriminate, judge, indulge in flights of imagination, write poetry and create works of art. Physical dimensions are no criteria of the heights to which his imagination can ascend, or his moral and spiritual expansion. His wisdom is not judged by the size of his hat, or the alacrity with which he walks is measured by the size of his shoes. Strength of a creed is not judged by the awe-inspiring buildings which its followers have erected, by its complex ritual and rites, but by the ability of its adherents to see in signs and symbols the means to enlightenment.

Religious beliefs exert a tremendous influence on our behaviour and character. When our mind gets closed behind the barriers of fixed convictions, it tends to undergo spiritual atrophy. Life is continual movement. In our dynamic quest for reality, there may not be community of approach, but there should be community of aspiration. If I were asked what man's earnest longing should be, I would say, it is the unfolding of one's own self, so that it may be able to perceive the light of God. Light does not enter a room through closed doors. When we are afflicted with so many inhibitions—inhibitions about our own self, the society in which we live—our potential enemies, and even about our tried friends, with all these inhibitions we are bound to be oblivious to the deep current of life, which holds things together in an eternal embrace.

In the last resort the strength of a creed does not reside in the number of its followers or its sound financial position, but by the dynamic force which governs the daily conduct of its adherents. The questions which each one of us has to ask himself are: (1) Have I the right to claim the monopoly of truth and reality?; (2) Does my affinity and spirit of kinship extend only to those who are of the same house of faith?; (3) In submitting myself to the moral judgment of others should I be judged by my creed or my conduct?; (4) Within my own limitations, do I endeavour to promote the cultural and spiritual wealth of the community? The answer to these questions is an indication of our growth in the realm of the spirit.

---

# THE MINISTER

**BY A MEMBER OF A CONGREGATION**

**Enid Shears**

A MINISTER wrote in *The Inquirer* some months ago about the problem of giving his congregation what they wanted. He gave an account of his difficulties in compiling a sermon which would meet the requirements of high-brow, middle-brow and low-brow alike, bearing in mind that all have not reached the same stage of mental development. He commented on the problem of trying to please everybody and was baffled as to how it could be done.

Our Unitarian ministers have undertaken to seek the truth and impart their personal findings to those of us who, in our lay and not so enlightened way, are not able to seek it for ourselves with the same undivided purpose. We have our living to earn in other ways. We have families to look after. Ministers concentrate on spiritual matters and have a vocation to do so, and it is our privilege to benefit by their specialized thought.

Do we want our minister to give us what we want, in the sense the writer in *The Inquirer* suggested? Do we want to be preached down to if our level is not up to his? Do we want to sit, uncomprehending, while he holds forth on theological theses far above our heads? Do we want him to placate us, soothe us, stroke us into a state of semi-somnolence? Or rouse, agitate us, provoke us into seething reaction at his utterances? We don't want him to set out to do any of these things—although personally I would rather be roused, if there is a choice, than reduced to a state of apathy.

I think the preacher's function is to seek the truth and to offer what he discovers with all the honesty he can command, if we are ever to move away from the credulities and the acceptances which formed — naturally enough — the beliefs of a less enlightened age. We want him to take us a step farther in the evolution of religious thought, and to encourage us to look critically at his findings; to question where we cannot assimilate; to reserve our judgment if we cannot at the moment agree; to share his inspiration where he hits on any clue which can help us to unfold the mystery with which this scheme of things is shrouded. We don't expect infallibility; we expect deep thought and a reverence for the fundamentals of life, offered to us from the pulpit as an expression of his beliefs, in the manner which is characteristically his, and enables him to do the fullest justice to his views, whether it be in a gentle monotone or with the emphasis of fiery eloquence; whether in words of one syllable or six, according to his vocabulary, as long as he has something which it is of vital importance for him to say.

The suggestion in *The Inquirer* that the preacher should give his congregation what they want defeats, to my mind, the whole object of preaching, which is to voice the truth according to his viewpoint and not according to anyone else's, including the often conflicting views of his hearers. The method of delivery does not matter. The thinker is not always articulate and the practised orator has not always anything of consequence to say.

★

What an assorted group a congregation can be! Some of us are pacifists and others think the Sermon on the Mount is not applicable to modern times, or not practical, or not even ethical. Some of us think that politics — the national and international ordering of human affairs — is, or should be, very much the concern of those with a moral concern; others believe that politics are entirely secular and must not gate-crash, however ethically treated, into the pulpit. Some of us believe that there is but one spirit which is indivisibly God; others that this basic oneness, though not material, can be split up into individual entities which are our immortal souls in perpetuity. Some of us think that our life here encompasses the full scope of our separateness as personal entities. Some of us are humanists and think the scheme of things can be run from now on by human agency. Others believe in God and regard man as not necessarily the last word in evolution. And so on.

What a task our minister would have if he tried to give us all what we wanted!

The common denominator which should hold us all is the search for truth. Beyond that, no minister can hope to ride all our pet hobby horses, or alternatively, eliminate from his sermons all those which are not acceptable to one or other of us. What dull sermons they would be!

★

A part of the fascination of being a Unitarian is that all ministers do not think alike. I have heard and read a good many, here and elsewhere. Some could preach in any denomination and not be very much out of place. Others have been so original and revolutionary that they, like Jesus and other prophets, have been hard put to it to get any contemporary hearing. There are ministers who, while keeping abreast with modern thought, yet retain tradition in their dress and conduct of the service. There are those who regard the Bible as the only legitimate source of reading for the Lessons, and those who find in literature generally, thoughts of spiritual significance. There are those who use a service-book as a fit and proper pattern for religious worship and those who regard formal repetition as unworthy of the particular nature of Unitarianism. There are those who think a sermon must necessarily be based on a text from the Bible, and those who find "sermons in stones" or in any and every aspect of human affairs. Some are Christocentric, and others believe that human holiness and wisdom cannot be measured and its maximum pin-pointed, on incomplete evidence, on any one man for all time, without, to some extent, accepting the orthodox view of special incarnation. There are those who preach for ten minutes and those who can't get all they have to say in an hour! This is as it should be. We have our preferences, but there is no set pattern in a movement which abhors uniformity.

With this variety of personnel in our ministry, how can it be hoped to suit the needs, consistently, of all congregations, who also have their special idiosyncrasies.

It is, therefore, far more desirable that the minister should be himself, work it out in his own way and make his own distinctive contribution rather than that he should attempt the well-nigh impossible task of giving us all what we think we want, even in order to maintain the numbers of his congregation. Do we want to be held by being pandered to and treated like children who sulk when they are not always given what they want? Wouldn't we rather take the larger view that if we take exception to what is expressed and leave the church, we are thereby contributing to the possible extinction of a church which is attempting to free the human mind from the shackles of dictated belief and authoritarian dogma?

For these and other services of our minister, what can we offer in return? Even if they could be valued in hard cash, he gets an inadequate stipend which must give him some headaches. We must at least maintain his modest salary and contribute as liberally as we can. We must listen with our minds to the message he has searchingly laboured to compile. Be critical, if necessary, but not carping. Be willing to take up with him any point which eludes our understanding. Remain loyal to the cause of the spiritual advancement of the human race which he serves, and remember that he is human too and needs a little encouragement in the exacting work he has undertaken to do. There is nothing which requires more logical precision than truth-finding. Then I think we shall present no problem to our minister, even if he dares to voice an opinion of his own which doesn't happen to be ours!

---

# TENSION AND HOPE

## A UNITARIAN MEMORANDUM

THE General Assembly Council at its recent meeting referred to the Social Service Department for study and report the resolution arising from the Call to Freedom document which was passed at the General Assembly Annual Meetings. The Social Service Department appointed a small commission to consider the problem. Its members—Mrs. Crosskey, of Birmingham; Mr. W. Lloyd, of Doncaster; Mr. C. Wykes, of Leicester, and Rev. Arthur Peacock—have held two meetings and arising from their discussions the following statement has been drafted. This has now been sent to six well-known Unitarians who have special interests in international affairs and these friends have been invited to submit papers dealing with the five points set out in the concluding section of the memorandum. When these papers are received the commission will meet again and, after study of them, they will be submitted to the G.A. Council along with comments and suggestions from the members of the commission. It is planned to complete the study in time for the October meeting of the Council.

---

**"I am a stranger and afraid**
**In a world I never made."**

These lines of A. E. Housman are indicative of the mood of the ordinary man and woman today. Tension and uncertainty is found all round, and the individual feels overwhelmed and lost amid the many complications of our large-scaled society. It is impressed upon him often that the radical changes achieved by science have brought mankind to the threshold of an era that offers untold opportunities for the future. At the same time there grows the fear that this new knowledge, which has resulted in so many radical changes in our society, may easily bring us to the brink of catastrophe

and even annihilation if it is used recklessly. The propaganda activities of the local nuclear disarmament committees which have been lately organized have done a great deal to bring home to the individual that nuclear war may very speedily bring annihilation to him and all his neighbourhood.

★

The task of our commission is to present factual information showing the causes of the present tensions and suggesting lines of possible action which our churches could take in the hope of making a practical contribution towards achieving better relationships and releasing people from the fear which now grips so many lives.

It would seem to us that the causes of the tensions may be set out as follows :—

(1) The ideological war which puts the world into two camps.

(2) The demand for self-government which comes from colonial territories, and the concern in effecting this to protect the interests of minorities.

(3) The attempt to segregate peoples, to treat coloured peoples as inferiors and to discriminate against them.

(4) The conflict in the Middle East which is rooted in the establishment of the State of Israel and in the rivalry that exists between it and the Arab States. Linked with this, too, is the acute and distressing problems of refugees and stateless persons who for long now have been living under appalling conditions and for whom the future offers very little hope.

(5) The development of nuclear weapons occasions fear, both among the nations possessing them and among those who lack the same. It occasions efforts of smaller nations to join what has been called "The nuclear club".

★

To us, these would seem to be the major causes of the tensions in the world today, and the feeling of fear that is so prevalent. The paramount question calling for our attention is this : How can the situation be solved and reconciliation brought about ? It seems to us the following ways are possible and call for study :—

(1) The settlement of outstanding problems through the machinery of the United Nations; how that organization's machinery may be strengthened to secure greater effectiveness; how public opinion in support of the activities of U.N. and its specialized agencies may be created, especially among the churches.

(2) The problem of self-government and the protection of minority interests; a study of the rights involved, the historical background to the situation and how the situation can best be handled so as to avoid the serious and violent unrest such as prevails in Cyprus in recent times and in places like Kenya.

(3) The problem of race discrimination and how relationships can be brought about so that the treatment of coloured peoples is in accordance with the declaration of human rights; how a public opinion aiming at just treatment of the coloured peoples may be created by the churches and action taken by local congregations so as to bring about co-operation and goodwill between people of different nationalities who are residing in our midst.

(4) The Middle East; a study of the background to the present situation and an indication of possible lines of dealing with the problem so that tensions between Israel and Arab States may lessen; what might be done to solve the distressing problem of the countless refugees in this area.

(5) A survey of the situation regarding nuclear weapons and the views as to how practical steps may be made towards achieving effective control as a first step, and then disarmament.

# Correspondence

*Letters should be addressed to the Editor, "The Inquirer", 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C. 1. They should not in general exceed three to four hundred words in length.*

## "The Lambeth Conference"

SIR,—As an Anglican who has great respect for the ideals and beliefs of the Liberal Christian, may I be permitted to reply, as briefly, but as fully as possible, to Malcolm Rutt's masterpiece of shallow, confused and illogical thought, avoiding making any dogmatic assertions of my own.

He is just talking dangerous nonsense in implying that, because Parliament is the only body that is in a position to legally remove an item from the form of worship of the Church of England, it must be the sole "authority" for that Foundation wholly and completely. In any case, he appears to fail to realize that, just as Liberal Christian thought has considerably changed within the past century, it is quite possible that a creed, first formulated in the fourth century and accepted by a certain section of the tragically-divided Church in 1662, does not necessarily indicate the norm of belief three hundred years later, even though it may still appear in print. Restricting myself to facts, as a layman I can only state that in a lifetime of worship in Anglican Churches in various parts of the country, I have never heard it recited once.

But to revert to this question of "authority". In exposing his ignorance of the fact that Parliament has *no power whatsoever* over the Spiritual well-being, teaching or belief of the millions of members of the Church of England the world over, he goes on to attempt to equate what legal, material powers it has in the *organization* of the Church with that of the Spiritual dictatorship of the Pope. The futility and illogicality of his arguments immediately become apparent. It seems necessary to re-emphasize the fact that the word "Church" means, simply, "the whole body of Christians", a definition that can be checked in any dictionary. We may be the so-called "Established" Church, but we most definitely are not, and never will be (God forbid!) a state Church, which is the logical interpretation of your correspondent's assertions.

If he knows even a little of the history of the Christian Church it is surely unnecessary to remind him of the events leading up to the separation of East from West in the 11th century, and the further break from Rome in the 16th century. But it does seem imperative to point out that this latter division was caused fundamentally by the increasing revolt against the Totalitarianism of Rome and that the Church which broke away, *protesting* became known as the *Protestant* Church — one which originally included the forbears of the Liberal Christian of today! Therefore, his simple reason for the "great divide" or "contradiction" (to quote) stated in such a categorical and knowledgeable way, would appear to be little more than the product of a rather vivid imagination, for the separation is perpetuated, despite approaches made continually since 1718 by Canterbury, by the fact that Rome still claims exclusively to be the one and only true Church in the world, insisting at the same time that the Pope has complete and sole authority over every aspect of belief of each single individual within her Church. This somehow seems to indicate that the Church of England is still protesting over the right of an individual's "free spirit", does it not Mr. Rutt?

In conclusion may I make an appeal. Instead of a continual series of attacks of one sect or section of the Church upon another, in which differences are only too frequently emphasized doing good to none and infinite harm to all in alienating completely the many outside the Church and distressing those within, let us concentrate upon reaffirming the similarities of belief and the one aim behind all denominations—that of loving God and loving one's neighbour as oneself. I therefore end my letter with an appeal for *tolerance*—which is one word no one could apply to the ludicrous suggestion in the last paragraph of your correspondent's letter, least of all a Unitarian, one of whose affirmations is "The Brotherhood of Man".

*Margate* *Raymond R. Reed*

## "He Drew A Circle . . ."

SIR,—Every now and then, someone quotes in your columns, in a letter or an article, the lines

He drew a circle to shut me out—
"Heretic", "rebel", a thing to flout.
But Love and I had the wit to win:
We drew a circle that shut him in.

The exact wording seems to vary each time the lines are quoted, and no one ever mentions the author's name.

Is there a learned reader of *The Inquirer* who could tell one ignorant Unitarian (1) the author's name, (2) a little about him (unless it was Shakespeare or Patience Strong), (3) the correct text, (4) where and when it first appeared, and (5) what the context was—what event, if any, provoked it?

*Finchley.* *Alastair Ross.*

---

# "THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY OF HEALING"

## A REPORT

### By Peter B. Godfrey

ANYONE who visits the chronically ill must have wondered to himself whether by so doing he has really helped the sick person, if there was something else he could have done. Above all this is true of the minister. Has he talked of the right things? Could he have done more?

If he has not thought seriously about "faith healing" before becoming a minister it is not long before the new minister does so. The stories he reads of remarkable cures of terrible illnesses are related in his mind to the chronically ill he has been visiting, and he wonders, "Can that illness really be cured? Is it possible that I am not doing for Mr. X what I might be doing?"

While wondering this the minister, or any visitor of the sick, will not do amiss to read the report of a commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1953. The report was published a few weeks ago with the title, "The Church's Ministry of Healing".

★

The first aim of the commission is expressed in its terms of reference: "To consider the theological, medical, psychological and pastoral aspects of 'Divine Healing' with a view to providing within two or three years a report designed to guide the Church to clearer understanding of the subject".

In the earliest pages of the report the commission rejects the use of such terms as "divine healing", "faith healing" or "spiritual healing". "Faith healing" is rejected because of the implication that those who do not recover from illness have not sufficient faith in God. "This" the report says, "is a cruel and false doctrine". "Spirit healing", when used to mean the cure of bodily ailments by means other than medical science, implies that other methods are not necessarily spiritual. "Divine healing" conceals the fact that in one sense all healing is divine, and it may well imply that God only shows His concern for the sick by means of extraordinary cures.

The report speaks strongly in favour of co-operation between doctors and ministers. It rejects the idea that it is the doctor's duty merely to minister to bodily health and the priest's exclusive duty to minister to spiritual needs. "Face to face with a patient the doctor and the priest are dealing, not the one simply with a sick body and the other simply with a sick soul, but with a person".

The commission comes to the heart of the matter when it considers the question of whether or not a healing is caused by the grace of God. Its answer is similar to that adopted by many who seek to reconcile religion and science. It is that man looks at things from different points of view: thus Coulson, for example, argues in his analogy of the mountain. "It is scientifically meaningless", says the report, "to enquire whether a healing is caused by the Grace of God. . . . Does this mean that there can be no evidence that healing is 'caused' by the powers of the Kingdom of God? There can be no scientific evidence, but it does not follow that there cannot be reasons for believing of a different order".

★

The believer, the report is saying, approaches healing from a different direction to that of scientific inquiry. "The believer's *starting point* is knowledge of the saving activity of God, and he proceeds to discern in the event a 'sign' of that activity; whereas the method of scientific inquiry is to *start with* the event and then to seek to understand it in terms of ever more comprehensive generalizations and theories". (The italics are the report's.)

We are bound to ask how one comes by this "knowledge of the saving activity". The report says elsewhere, "The activity of God in human life cannot be discerned unless the observer's eyes have been opened by the supernatural gift of faith — just as the meaning of a page of German cannot be discerned unless the reader has learned the language".

Can we really be satisfied with this, even apart from the fact that the analogy is false as learning German is not a supernatural gift? Everybody can claim that he is right and his opponent only fails to see the fact because his eyes have not been opened for him.

★

Very probably this is just how the "faith healers" might react to the report of the commission itself. For the report is highly critical of the claims of faith healing. Quoting the British Medical Association committee on the subject, it says, "Some at any rate of the assertions of healing prove on testing to be mistaken". It reminds faith healers that "to say that a healing is medically extraordinary is not to say that it depended on some non-medical intervention which preceded it. A successful healer may, even unknown to himself, be using the well-known process of suggestion". The report suggests that remissions in an illness are taken by the medically ignorant as signs of a cure, and faith healers claim them as such. The commission also thinks that faith healers fall for the *post hoc ergo propter hoc* fallacy. Because event B (the cure) follows event A (the faith healer's technique), therefore event A is the cause of event B.

In this respect, the report clearly seems guilty of having two standards, one by which it judges against the claims of the faith healer, and the other by which it accepts all the healings recorded in the New Testament, for the commission accepts these just as they are written. No doubt there would be a great outcry if the commission subjected the New Testament healings to the same critical consideration to which they subject the claims of faith healers today.

These two standards weaken the value of the report. However, it also seems to fail in its own object of "guiding the Church to clearer understanding of the subject".

★

Undoubtedly, there is much in the report that is useful and interesting, for example, the suggestions about sick visiting and the desired relationship between minister and doctor. However, the report has an uncertainty about it. We are told that there are different ways of looking at things: for example, from the religious point of view, or from the scientific standpoint. To look from the first point of view one's eyes have to be opened. However, from which point of view is faith healing being condemned? If from the scientific then surely the faith healer may claim that this does not see the whole picture. If from the religious point of view then he might say that the eyes of the members of the commission have not been sufficiently widely opened.

The commission seems to mix the two points of view, leaving the reader uncertain and confused. Perhaps this reflects the views of the members of the commission: but one had hoped for more after five years' deliberation.

## IT OCCURRED TO ME

**By Muriel Hilton**

THE other day I came across a quotation from the writings of Winifred Holtby which said, "Shall we try to show them that life is a lovely thing?" I don't know the context of the passage, but I do know that Winifred Holtby did manage to show us that life is a lovely thing, and she managed to do this in spite of the fact that towards the end of her life she was seriously ill and knew that she was going to die whilst still a young woman. She died in her thirties. Perhaps her illness, the knowledge of the possible shortness of her days stirred her to a greater response to the beauty and loveliness of life, for she certainly had a vivid appreciation and a sense of indebtedness for all that had been given her. She once wrote a poem called "The Debt" which begins:—

"I owe so large a debt to life,
I think if I should die today
My death would never quite repay
For music, friends, and careless laughter,
The swift, light-hearted interplay
Of wit on ready wit, and after
The silence that most blessed falls
Across the room and firelit walls
And quells our flame of jesting strife. . . ."

When re-reading that poem the other day I could not help but think how much heaviness would be lifted if everyone cultivated and expressed in various ways their indebtedness for such gifts as "music, friends and careless laughter". It would certainly help "to make life a lovely thing".

★

The second shell Mrs. Lindbergh takes into her hand when she is alone on holiday is a moonshell. There is pencilled on its smooth surface a perfect spiral "winding inward to the pinpoint centre of the shell, the tiny dark core of the apex, the pupil of the eye". Mrs. Lindbergh contemplates this mysterious single eye and writes with rare charm on all that is evoked by this perfect little shell. We are all of us essentially alone, she reiterates, and yet in this modern world we persist in denying and running away from this basic phenomenon. We are frightened of solitude. We will do anything rather than face the inwardness, the loneliness of our own nature. And yet solitude is a necessity, and we can only really touch other people's hearts when we ourselves are poised, self-contained and whole.

A woman's life is naturally one of giving, but there is so much purposeless activity that the springs become dry and need to be replenished. Solitude, Mrs. Lindbergh thinks, is the great replenisher of life. A woman ought to insist on a time for solitude each day in order to find again her true essence. She believes that inward stillness must be found in the midst of activities which Charles Morgan describes as "the stilling of the soul within the activities of the mind and body so that it may be still as the axis of a revolving wheel is still". That is a beautiful image and one ever to keep in mind.

It is this drawing together of a self, this living from the centre, which is of such compelling necessity if life is to be free in some measure from fragmentation.

The church which is a great centring force is never more needed than it is today, and women who have always been its mainstay realize this more than men. Women must be the pioneers in this turning inward for strength. The moonshell speaks of solitude and Mrs. Lindbergh decides to take it home with her to place on her desk. "You will remind me", she writes, "that women must still be as the axis of a wheel in the midst of her activities; that she must be the pioneer in achieving this stillness, not only for her own salvation, but for the salvation of family life, of society, perhaps even of our civilization".

★

It is one of the great pleasures of our church life to meet members of our household of faith from other countries. We have had several visits from American Unitarians this year, and recently we had the pleasure of meeting Mr. and Mrs. Tunstall from our Cape Town church by whom we have sent greetings to their minister and congregation. One of our members, Mrs. Greenhill, met them some years ago when on holiday in that part of South Africa and has always spoken warmly of their kindness to her. It was an unexpected and delightful pleasure for her to see them again.

A charming gift came through Mrs. Tunstall from the Women's League of the Cape Town church. She gave us a money gift with which to buy flowers for the church "when the gardens are bare". So in the winter we shall see flowers given from our friends in South Africa and there will be a small card to that effect on the flower table. It was a charming gesture and one that indeed helps "to make life a lovely thing".

---

## From My Journal

**By "Simplicitas"**

THE thoughts of our folk are full of holidays, and we are busy exchanging experiences. Mrs. M. was extolling the delights of X. "Oh, Mr. S.", she said, "they have the most wonderful shops there". I recalled remarking to Ruth one Monday of our own holiday how every holiday-maker on the bus seemed to tender the fares with "Shops, please". No one asked for the beach unless he had children with him. Every day there was a dense stream of window shoppers, up one side of the main street and down the other; even on holiday, still attracted to the things they would like to possess. How shall we draw this advertisement-ridden generation to look upon all things lovely?

★

My last entry recalls another holiday experience. A long drawn-out straggle of walkers was approaching us. I rejoiced to think that so many had chosen the country pursuits of a holiday fellowship group. As the little groups passed us on the hill-top road one couldn't help catching snatches of their conversation. "He was in and out of five hospitals. . . ." "I spent £20 on having it overhauled but I think I shall go in for the newer model. . . ." "We always look in at. . . ." Hills and valleys of surpassing beauty lay on either side of us, but their thoughts were upon themselves and their possessions.

★

There are always those who hold and those who give. A particularly delicious dish at our hotel made my wife, Ruth, say she would ask our proprietress for the recipe. "I shouldn't do that", said a fellow diner. "She won't give away any tips. I asked for a recipe at Y. last year, and she said she wouldn't give away any secrets until she retired, and then she'd write a book and we could buy it". However, our conversation must have been overheard, for next morning with our letters, was the recipe in question, neatly typed.

★

It was mercifully only on the last day of our stay that a letter re-addressed to me gave my "Rev." away. I had enjoyed seeing the folk at our table as they really are. Now I only saw them as they imagined I wanted them to be. Our Cockney clerk was beginning to hold forth about the change of show at the Pavilion when he was halted by an obvious kick from his wife, who thereupon hastily began addressing me on the flora and fauna of the district. Unfortunately, she got a bit mixed, and spoke as though fauna were flowers until Ruth, who has a sense of the ridiculous, had to leave the table under pretence of choking. Why is it people act a part to parsons? I enjoyed our friends a great deal more before we got to the flora and fauna stage. We parsons enjoy people for what they are, and we like them to be themselves.

# THE CALENDAR OF THE CHURCHES

SUNDAY, AUGUST 3, 1958

ABERDEEN, Unitarian Church, Skene Street, 11 and 6, Rev. W. B. TAVENER
ABERYSTWYTH, New Street Meeting House, 11, Rev. J. CERAM DAVIES
ALTRINCHAM, Dunham Road Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ARTHUR W. VALLANCE
AINSWORTH, Unitarian Church, Knowsley Road, 11.15 and 3, Rev. B. GILL
ASTLEY, Unitarian Chapel, Manchester Road, 6.30, Supply
BATH, Trim Street Chapel, Unitarian, 11, Rev. S. SPENCER
BELFAST, All Souls, Elmwood Avenue, 11.30 and 7, Dr. A. L. AGNEW
BELFAST, First Church, Rosemary Street, 11.30 and 7, Mr. JAMES MCCLELLAND
BESSELS GREEN (nr. Sevenoaks), Unitarian Church, 11, Mr. J. NICHOLSON
BILLINGSHURST, Free Church, High Street, 11, Miss L. M. HOBGOOD
BIRKENHEAD, Unitarian Church Bessborough Road, 6.30 (August 10) Supply
BIRMINGHAM, Church of Messiah, Broad Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GORDON STUART
BIRMINGHAM, Waverley Road Church, and Hurst Street Mission, Small Heath, 6.30, Mr. G. WILKINSON
BLACKPOOL, North Shore, Dickson Road, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. E. A. WEST
BLACKPOOL, South Shore, Lytham Road, 11 and 6.30, Mr. FRANK LOWE
BOLTON, Bank Street, 2.30, Sunday School, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. I. L. TORLAND
BOLTON, Unity Church, Deane Road, 10.30 and 6.30, Mr. T. SHARPLES
BOSTON (Lincs.), Unitarian Chapel, Spain Lane, 6.30, Rev. HENRY HALL
BOURNEMOUTH, Unitarian Church, West Hill Road, 11, Rev. LAWRENCE REDFERN
BRADFORD, Broadway Avenue, 3.15, Mr. BILL DAVIES
BRADFORD, Town Hall Square, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. FRANK A. BULLOCK
BRIDGWATER, Christ Church, Dampiet Street, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Supply
BRIDPORT, Unitarian Chapel, 11, Rev. G. RANDALL JONES
BRIGHTON, Christ Church Unitarian, New Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. JOHN ROWLAND
BRISTOL, Lewin's Mead Meeting, 6.30, Rev. L. A. GARRARD
BRISTOL, Oakfield Road, 11, Rev. L. A. GARRARD, 6.30, Miss F. BRADFIELD
BURNLEY, Unitarian Church, Trafalgar Street, 3, Rev. L. HALLWORTH
BURY, Bank Street, 11, Rev. JOHN MATHER, 6.30, Miss HESKETH
CAMBRIDGE, Memorial Church, Emmanuel Road, 11, Rev. E. A. LEAR
CARDIFF, The West Grove Unitarian Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. T. J. JONES
CHATHAM, The Church of the Great Companions, Hamond Hill, 3, Rev. WILL HAYES
CHELTENHAM, Bayshill Unitarian Church, Royal Well, 11, Study Service, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. J. M. QUINE
CHESTER, Matthew Henry's Chapel, Trinity Street, 11, Rev. L. A. GRIBBLE, 6.30, Miss R. HEDFORD
CHESTERFIELD, Elder Yard Church, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. ERIC SHAW
CHOWBENT, Chapel, Atherton, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. KENNETH TWINN
COVENTRY, Great Meeting House, Holyhead Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. H. MORRIS
CREWE, Free Christian Church, Bank Street, 6.30, Supply
CREWKERNE, Unitarian Church, Hermitage Street, 11 and 6.30, Mrs. M. R. DICKIN
CROYDON, Free Christian Church, Wellesley Road, 11, Children's Service, 6.30, Rev. R. TAYLER
DEVIZES, Wilson Street Chapel, 11, Children's Chapel, 6.30, Rev. F. COTTER
DERBY, Friar Gate Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Supply
DITCHLING, Old Meeting House, 10.45, Mr. C. S. DENCY
DONCASTER, Free Christian Church, Hall Gate, 11 and 6.30, Rev. G. W. PARKINSON
DOVER, Adrian Street, Unitarian Church, 11, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. PHILIP C. WHITEMAN
DUBLIN, Stephen's Green, West, 11.30 and 7.30, Rev. E. SAVELL HICKS
DUDLEY, Old Meeting House, Wolverhampton Street, 11 and 6.30, No Services
DUKINFIELD, Old Chapel, Chapel Hill, 10.45 and 6.30, Mr. C. E. MORRIS
DUNDEE, Unitarian Church, 53 Constitution Road, 11, Rev. S. E. BOWEN
EDINBURGH, St. Mark's Church, Castle Terrace, 11 and 6.30, Supply
EXETER, George's Chapel, South Street, 6.30, No Service
GEE CROSS, Hyde Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. J. HARRY SMITH
GLASGOW, St. Vincent Street, Unitarian Church, 11, Rev. JOHN CAVILEEN
GLOSSOP, Fitzalan Street, 2, Sunday School, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. W. H. CORDELL
GLOUCESTER, Barton Street, 3, Rev. J. M. QUINE
GREAT YARMOUTH, Old Meeting (Unitarian) Church, Middlegate Street, 7, Rev. H. BACON
GUILDFORD, Ward Street Church, 11.15, No Services during August
HALE CHAPEL, Hale Barns, 10.45 and 6.30, Supply
HALIFAX, Northgate End, 10.45, Supply, 6.30, Rev. J. B. TONKIN
HASTINGS, Free Christian Church, South Terrace, 11, Rev. DENDRIC HILTON, 6.30, Mrs. MURIEL HILTON
HINCKLEY, Great Meeting, Baines Lane, 11 and 6, Supply
HORSHAM, Worthing Road, 6.30, Rev. J. MARTIN HALL
HUDDERSFIELD, Fitzwilliam Street, 11, Rev. J. B. TONKIN
HULL, Park Street Church (Unitarian), 6.30, Rev. ERNEST PEEL
ISLE OF WIGHT, Newport, High Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. W. J. CARTER
KENDAL, Market Place, Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Rev. T. WARDLE
KIDDERMINSTER, New Meeting House, 11, Rev. EDGAR W. HILL
KNUTSFORD, Brook Street Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. ALBERT SMITH
LANCASTER, St. Nicholas Street Church, 6.30, Supply
LEEDS, Mill Hill Chapel, City Square, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. R. L. GOLLAND
LEICESTER, Narborough Road, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Mr. C. V. WALTON
LEICESTER, The Great Meeting, East Bond Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. LEONARD MASON
LETCHWORTH, Secretary, Miss J. F. LOCKNER, Killarney, Garth Road, 11, ——
LEWES, Westgate Chapel, 11.15, Mr. A. G. TARRANT
LINCOLN, High Street, Unitarian Chapel, 6.30, Rev. H. W. KINNELL
LIVERPOOL, Ancient Chapel of Toxteth, 11, Rev. C. A. PIPER, 6.30, Supply
LIVERPOOL, Bootle Free Church, 11, Rev. NORMAN KIRKHAM
LIVERPOOL, Domestic Mission, Mill Street, 6.30, Rev. J. KEN MORRIS
LIVERPOOL, Gateacre Chapel, 11, Rev. STANLEY R. BUTLER
LIVERPOOL, Hamilton Road, Everton, 3, Sunday School, 6.30, Rev. NORMAN KIRKHAM
LIVERPOOL, Hope Street, 6.30, Supply
LIVERPOOL, Ullet Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. B. SHORT
LONDON, Bell Street, Edgware Road, 6, Rev. WALTER M. LONG
LONDON, Blackfriars Mission and Stamford Street Chapel, 6.30, Rev. R. E. GODDARD
LONDON, Brixton, Effra Road, 11, Rev. E. G. LEE
LONDON, Essex Church, Palace Gardens Terrace, Notting Hill Gate, 11, Rev. R. TAYLER, 6.30, Supply
LONDON, Forest Gate, Upton Lane, 6.30, no service
LONDON, Golders Green, Hoop Lane, 6.30, Mr. J. ROBBINS
LONDON, Hackney, New Gravel Pit Church, Chatham Place, 6.30, Supply (also 11, 1st Sunday in the month)
LONDON, Hampstead, Rosslyn Hill, 11, Rev. DONALD P. MAW
LONDON, Highgate Hill Unitarian Church, 11, Mr. J. ROBBINS
LONDON, Ilford High Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. T. E. DALTON
LONDON, Islington, Upper Street, Provost Hall, 6.30, No Service
LONDON, Kilburn Unitarian Christian Church, Quex Road, 11, No Service
LONDON, Lewisham Unitarian Church, High Street, 11, Miss E. M. BUTCHER
LONDON, Leytonstone, Lea Bridge Road, Knotts Green, 6.30, No Service
LONDON, Mansford Street Church, Bethnal Green, 6.30, Mr. S. R. MARTIN
LONDON, Richmond Free Church, Ormond Road, 11, Rev. WALTER M. LONG
LONDON, Stratford, West Ham Lane, Unitarian Church, 11.30, Children's Church, 6.30, Rev. F. HANKINSON
LONDON, Wandsworth Unitarian Church, East Hill, 11, Mr. W. REEVE
LONDON, Welsh Unitarian Church at Highgate Hill Unitarian Church, 1st and 3rd Sundays, 6, Rev. T. L. JONES
LONDON, Wood Green, Unity Church, Newnham Road, 6.30, Mr. R. H. CORRICK
LYTHAM ST. ANNES (Ansdell), Channing Road, 11, Rev. W. A. M. HELLABY
MACCLESFIELD, King Edward Street, 10.45, Rev. O. D. FOSTER, 6.30, Supply
MAIDSTONE, Unitarian Church, Market Buildings, 6.30, Rev. DENDRIC HILTON
MANCHESTER, Blackley Unitarian Church, Chapel Lane, 6.30, Rev. DAVID C. DOEL
MANCHESTER, Cross Street Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Dr. R. W. WILDE
MANCHESTER, Gorton, Brookfield Church, Hyde Road, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. MAURICE BENNETT
MANCHESTER, Monton Church, Eccles, 10.45, Rev. J. HAZLEHURST, 6.30, Mr. F. C. MARON
MANCHESTER, Pendleton Unitarian, Cross Lane, 6.30, Rev. T. W. ROBERTS
MANCHESTER, Platt Chapel, Rusholme, 6.30, Rev. KENNETH WRIGHT
MANCHESTER, Renshaw Street Mission, 6.30, Rev. B. L. HOPKIN
MANCHESTER, Stand Chapel, Whitefield (August 10), 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. SYDNEY H. KNIGHT
MANCHESTER, Wilbraham Road, Chorlton-cum-Hardy, 11, Mr. PHILIP M. BROWN
MANCHESTER, Wythenshawe, Unitarian Church, Brownley Road, Benchill, 6.30, Rev. JOHN GILL
MANSFIELD, Old Meeting House, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. KENNETH SHERRATT
MARPLE, Unitarian Hall, 31 Stockport Road, 11 each Sunday
MIDDLESBROUGH, Free Christian Church 6.30, Rev. E. A. DAVIES
MIDDLETON, Old Road Chapel, 3.15, Rev. DAVID C. DOEL
MORETONHAMPSTEAD, 3 and NEWTON ABBOT, 6.30, Rev. C. G. THOMAS
NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE, The Church of the Divine Unity, Ellison Place, 11 and 6.30, Mr. B. EADES
NEWCHURCH (Rossendale), Bethlehem Unitarian Church, 10.30 and 6, (closed)
NORTHAMPTON, Kettering Road Church, 11, Mr. A. W. KERRY
NORWICH, Octagon Chapel, Colegate, 11, Rev. J. A. KENNEDY
NOTTINGHAM, High Pavement Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. C. GORDON BOLAM
OLDBURY, Unitarian Church, Birmingham Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. HAROLD A. GOOD
OLDHAM, Lord Street Chapel, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. T. E. NUTTALL
OXFORD, Manchester College Chapel, 11.30, Rev. H. L. SHORT
PADIHAM, Nazareth Unitarian Church, Knight Hill, 10.30 and 6, Rev. L. HALLWORTH
PARK LANE CHAPEL, near Wigan, 11 and 6.30, Rev. GORDON BEVERLEY
PLYMOUTH, Unitarian Church, Notte Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. E. H. KEMLEY
POOLE, Unitarian Church, Hill Street, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Rev. J. W. DUNBLE
PORTSMOUTH, John Pounds Memorial Church, High Street, 11, Junior Church, 6.30, Mr. J. R. SPURGEON
PRESTON, Unitarian Chapel, Church Street, 6.30, Rev. W. A. M. HELLABY
RINGWOOD, Hants., The Meeting House, 11, Rev. FRANCIS TERRY
RIVINGTON CHAPEL, Nr. Horwich, Lancs., 3, Rev. R. I. PRITCHARD
ROCHDALE, Blackwater Street, 10.30 and 6, Rev. F. W. BARR
ROTHERHAM, Church of Our Father, 10.45 and 6.30, Rev. E. PHILLIPS
SALE, Atkinson Road, 11, Rev. JOHN GILL
SCARBOROUGH, Unitarian Church, Westborough, 6.30, Mr. H. MATHEWS
SHEFFIELD (Attercliffe), 6.30, No Service
SHEFFIELD, Fulwood Old Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. F. SORELL
SHEFFIELD, Unity Church, Crookesmoor Road, 11 (only), Mr. C. ASHWORTH
SHEFFIELD, Upper Chapel, 11 and 6.30, Rev. G. STANLEY WHITBY
SHREWSBURY, High Street, Unitarian, 11 and 6.30, Supply
SIDMOUTH, Old Meeting, Unitarian, High Street, 11 and 6.30, Rev. H. WHITAKER
SOUTHAMPTON, Church of the Saviour, London Road, 6.30, Mr. DAVID L. HIGGS
SOUTHEND-ON-SEA, Darnley Road, 6.30, Mrs. J. WILLIAMS
SOUTHPORT, Portland Street Church, 11 and 6.30, Rev. T. J. JONES
STOCKPORT, Unitarian Church, St. Peter's Gate, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. J. R. BLACKBURN
ST. HELENS, Corporation Street, 6.30, Mrs. E. KERRY
STOCKTON-ON-TEES, Wellington Street, 6.30, Rev. A. D. WILLIAMS (also 11, 2nd Sunday in the month)
STOURBRIDGE, Presbyterian Unitarian Chapel, 11, Rev. C. STEPHEN
SWANSEA, Unitarian Church, High Street, 6.30, Rev. B. VERITY (also 11, First Sunday in the month)
SWANSEA, Penrhyd Free Christian Meeting House, 11, Supply
SWINTON, Swinton Hall Road, 6.30, Rev. P. B. GODFREY
TAUNTON, Mary St. Chapel, 11, Supply
TENTERDEN, Old Meeting House, Ashford Road, 6.30, Rev. G. KENNET
TODMORDEN, Unitarian Church, 10.45 and 6, Rev. ALEC L. FORBES
TORQUAY, Unity Church, Montpellier Road, 11 and 6.30, Rev. CHARLES EASTON
TROWBRIDGE, Conigre Unitarian Church, 6, Rev. S. SPENCER
WARRINGTON, Cairo Street, 10.30 and 6.30, Rev. ERIC WILD
WATFORD, Friends' House, Church Road (by permission), 7.30 (last Sunday in the month)
WALLASEY, Memorial Church, Manor Road, 11, Supply, 6.30, Rev. L. A. GRIBBLE
WALSALL, Unitarian Free Church, Stafford Street, 11, No Service
WEST BROMWICH, Lodge Road, 11, Children's Church, 6.15, Rev. R. J. WILLIAMSON
WEST KIRBY, Brookfield Gardens, 11, Rev. MAURICE JOHNSON (also 6.30, first Sunday in the month)
WHITBY, Flowergate, 6, Mrs. EVA GILL
WILMSLOW, Dean Row, 10.45, Rev. PRIESTLEY PHILLIPS. STYAL, 3, Rev. PRIESTLEY PHILLIPS
YORK, St. Saviourgate Chapel, 6.30 (suspended during August)
THE NATIONAL UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP provides for those unable to attend a Unitarian Church. For information write to the Secretary, N.U.F., 15 Gordon Sq., W.C.1.

## AUSTRALIA

ADELAIDE, Unitarian Christian Church, Wakefield St., 11 and 7, Rev. COLIN GIBSON
MELBOURNE, Unitarian Church, Cathedral Place, C.2.; Unitarian Half-Hour broadcast, 6.15. Services: 4 p.m., second Sunday in each month Evening 7 p.m., Rev. V. JAMES
PERTH, Western Australia, Unitarian Free Christian Fellowship, Rev. R. H. PLATHERSTON, 112 Duke Street, Scarborough, West Australia
SYDNEY, New South Wales, Unitarian Church, 15 Francis Street (off College St.), 7.15, Rev. D. W. BENTHAM, Manse Telephone LX 5121
UNITARIAN FELLOWSHIP OF AUSTRALIA, 1 Grice Alley, Melbourne, C.1. Minister: Rev. W. BOTTOMLEY. Meetings as advertised.
STANFORD COMMUNITY CHURCH, Austin Road, Seaford (Vic.) S.S. weekly at 2.15 p.m. Public Worship, fortnightly, 3.15 p.m. Minister: Rev. W. BOTTOMLEY

## CANADA

MONTREAL, Church of the Messiah, Sherbrooke Street West and Simpson Street, 11, Rev. ANGUS CAMERON
TORONTO, First Unitarian Church, 175 St. Clair Avenue West, 11, Rev. W. P. JENKINS
VANCOUVER, B.C., Unitarian Church of Vancouver, 1,550 Tenth Avenue West, 11, Rev. A. P. HEWETT

## NEW ZEALAND

AUCKLAND, Unitarian Church, Ponsonby Road, 11 and 7, Mr. M. J. WILSON
WELLINGTON, Service suspended — Enquiries — Mrs. WARREN. Tel. 40-232

## SOUTH AFRICA

CAPE TOWN, Hout Street, 11, Sunday School 7, Service, Rev. MAURICE C. BARTON

# THE LINDSEY PRESS

**THE SNOWDROP WHO COULDN'T**
**and other tales for children**
*by P. M. Brown*
**3s. 6d.** by post **4s.**

*Ten Minute Talks to Boys and Girls*

**SUNRISE IN THE WEST**
*by J. Harry Smith*
**2s.** by post **2s. 4d.**

**GOLDEN PAVEMENTS**
*by Bertram Lister, M.A.*
**2s. 6d.** by post **2s. 10d.**

**THE KING WHO WAS THIRSTY**
*by Bertram Lister, M.A.*
**1s. 6d.** by post **1s. 10d.**

**SEEING THINGS**
*by John Hinkins*
**1s.** by post **1s. 4d.**

**THE SECOND MILE**
*by W. J. McEldowney, LL.B.*
**1s. 6d.** by post **1s. 10d.**

**THE LINDSEY PRESS**
**15 GORDON SQUARE, LONDON, W.C.1**



**ADVERTISEMENT RATES**

**Births, Marriages, Deaths, Changes of Address**
2 lines, 6s. 0d. minimum. Each additional line, 2s. 0d.

**Miscellaneous — Prepaid**
4d. per word, minimum 5s.

**W. Heffer Hugo Press Organization Limited,**
**Kingsgate House, 115, Holborn, London, W.C.1.**
**Telephone: CHancery 8752**

**Display Rates on Application** **Special Terms for a Series**



## "The Unitarian"

"THE UNITARIAN", a monthly magazine of Unitarian news and views. Why not use it as an inset to your chapel calendar? Price twopence per copy (annual subscription, four shillings post free). Reduction in price for quantities. Inquiries to G. Harrison, 2 Walwyn Close, Stretford, Lancs.



## THE INQUIRER

All letters and manuscripts for the Editor must reach the Office not later than Monday morning for publication the same week. All communications must be accompanied by the name and address of the sender.

Subscription Rates: £1 1s. 10d. per annum (post free).

Those having any difficulty in obtaining copies of the paper should communicate direct with the publisher.

Address: 14 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1.
TEL.: EUS. 7334 Editorial: EUS. 2912


## Marriages

**Goring—Blake**—On Saturday, July 26, at Lewins Mead Meeting, Bristol, by the Rev. H. Stewart Carter, assisted by the Rev. A. H. Birtles, John Jeremy, elder son of Mr. and Mrs. L. J. Goring, Hatherley, Hassocks, Sussex, to Rosemary Joy, younger daughter of Mr. and Mrs. A. L. Blake, Westfield, Wincombe, Somerset. Address after August 12: 86 Edge Hill Court, Wimbledon, S.W.19.

**Martin—Jones**—On July 24, the Rev. Aubrey J. Martin, B.A., of Llwynrhydowen and Bwlchyfadfa, and Nancy W. Jones, B.A., of Tregroes, Llandysul, at Chorley Chapel, the Rev. R. Islwyn Pritchard, B.A., officiating.

**Newcastle upon Tyne:** An annual picnic was held on Saturday, July 19, 1958, and a large party of members and friends, with their families, including the minister, Rev. John Storer and Mrs. Storer and their two children, spent a most enjoyable day at Beadnell on the Northumberland coast. Both lunch and tea were taken on the sands with several spirit stoves going to provide hot water for tea-making.

# THE WOMEN'S LEAGUE—1910
# LIVERPOOL DISTRICT

**(The following is taken from the current News-Letter of the Women's League.)**

We like to think of them shaking a loose leg, well covered in black bottany wool and elastic-sided boots, wearing their long skirts over flannel petticoats, their boaters and veils—respectable and worthy ladies of Liverpool, who could call not only their souls but also their complexions their own.

Perhaps the cause dear to members before the first world war most likely to interest League members of today is that of the women forced to use the common lodging houses of Liverpool. Mrs. Charles Morrison introduced the subject at the annual meeting in 1910. Although not as many women then went out to work as now, industrial changes had created a considerable floating body of women workers who were very poor, often sweated, and who had no shelter except the common lodging houses. Of these lodging houses, twenty-five were registered, the condition of some being deplorable. In one, there was one sink and one comb: women had to strip and wash before men, and as there were no cupboards, they had to keep their personal and other property where they slept.

Before launching a public campaign, the committee arranged to meet the Medical Officer, Dr. Hope, and urge that a woman Inspector of Common Lodging Houses be appointed, and that a woman be in charge of each house. In many ways a progressive officer, Dr. Hope seemed to have been deaf and blind to the claims of women without homes in the city; he dismissed the reformers as a lot of sentimentalists.

When other cities were visited, it was found that Liverpool was far behind in provision of decent accommodation. The League members were fortunate in winning the support of the Liverpool *Post and Mercury*, which came out boldly with a demand for a Municipal Lodging House of the Manchester or Glasgow pattern. In the issue of June 25, 1910, they printed a letter which marks the highlight of this campaign for the District League. Miss Connell and Mrs. Billinge, two members intent on finding out the truth for themselves, decided to spend a night in a common lodging house. The *Post* printed their report.

Wearing old clothes, they presented themselves at 10 p.m., paid their fourpence to the man in charge, and were sent to the kitchen, a room containing only a long table and benches without backs. The man had free access to the scullery where everyone washed. There was no kettle or teapot; water was boiled in a workman's can and tea put in to brew. In the kitchen two old women sat quarrelling and drinking beer. The man showed them to their bedroom in which were six beds. The occupants for the other four did not appear until 2.30 a.m., when they came in and discussed in lively fashion their experiences with the men with whom they had spent the night.

Although the sheets had been used, they were fairly clean, but the beds were alive with bugs; so were the walls. Miss McConnell endured a night of torment, counting the hours until at 5 a.m. when she could stand no more, she got up. Down below, there were two washbowls, one very dirty towel, and no soap. After her night with the bugs and prostitutes, Mrs. Billinge managed to rouse someone to let her out at 6 a.m. and, mounting her bicycle, rode off to call on a friend, who gave her tea, removed some of her verminous clothing, and sent her home to a carbolic bath. It was clear that the house was mainly a resort for prostitutes; of vice, dirt and disease there was no lack, yet both ladies testified to the good humour, kindliness and sympathy shown not only to each other but to the visitors as well.

Next year the campaign had grown; a big public meeting took place, supported by prominent citizens, distinguished visitors, as well as the Liverpool Unitarians. Among the speakers was Mr. Fred Maugan, now better known as Lord Woolton. So the fight went on until this particular blot on the name of a city which had pioneered so much social reform was removed. When the District League held its fortieth anniversary in 1948, both the intrepid women who passed a night in a common lodging house were present to hear the cheers of a younger generation.

Printed by Wealdstone and Sons Ltd., Queen Road, Southend-on-Sea and Published by The Inquirer Publications Co. Ltd., at the Temporary Office, 14 Gordon Square, W.C.1.—Wednesday (Publication Date Thursday), Saturday, August 2, 1958